

Any Data Quality Objectives or Standard Operating Procedure used by the toxicity testing laboratory to identify and report valid, invalid, anomalous, or inconclusive effluent or receiving water toxicity test measurement results from the TST statistical approach, which include a consideration of concentration-response patterns and/or Percent Minimum Significant Differences (PMSD)s, must be submitted for review by the Regional Water Board, in consultation with USEPA and the State Water Board's Quality Assurance Officer and Environmental Laboratory Accreditations Program (40 CFR § 122.44(h)). The PMSD criteria only apply to compliance for NOEC and the sublethal endpoints of the NOEC, and therefore are not used to interpret TST results.

D. Final Effluent Limitation Considerations

1. Anti-Backsliding Requirements.

The final effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in the previous Order, No. R4-2013-0094. Section 402(o)(2) of the CWA provides statutory exceptions to the general prohibition of backsliding contained in CWA section 402(o)(1).

The final effluent limitations for heptachlor epoxide for Discharge Point 001 were removed because new monitoring data indicated that the effluent did not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the applicable water quality objectives. The original limit had been applied in the absence of reliable effluent data because the analytical method detection level approximated the limit. The removal of the final effluent limitations for heptachlor epoxide will therefore not authorize a change in the mass emission rates or a relaxation in the treatment of the discharge and meets the backsliding exception under CWA section 303(d)(4)(B).

The dilution ratio for Discharge Point 001 increased from 1:98 to 1:108 based on the results of the 2017 dilution study, but no water quality based effluent limits were changed as a result, and technically based effluent limits do not vary with the dilution. However, the chronic toxicity final effluent limitations for Discharge Point 001 were revised based on a new dilution ratio. The resulting IWC for chronic toxicity decreased slightly from 1.02% effluent in the 2013 permit to 0.93% effluent (see section IV.C.6.) in this Order. The treatment process is maintained and all constituents are discharged at concentrations below Ocean Plan limits after dilution, so the change continues to be consistent with the Ocean Plan Water Quality Objectives and will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial uses of the Pacific Ocean in the vicinity of Ormond Beach. This is consistent with the antidegradation policy and therefore meets the backsliding exception under CWA section 402(o)(1)/303(d)(4).

The accompanying monitoring and reporting program requires continued data collection and if monitoring data show reasonable potential for a constituent to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality standards, the Order will be reopened to incorporate WQBELs. Such an approach ensures that the discharge will adequately protect water quality standards for designated beneficial uses and conform with antidegradation policies and antibacksliding provisions.

2. Antidegradation Policies

This Order includes both narrative and numeric final effluent limitations, receiving water limitations, performance goals, and mass emission benchmarks to maintain the chemical, physical, and biological characteristics, and to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. These requirements ensure that all water quality objectives are being met outside the zone of initial dilution, thereby maintaining the beneficial uses. The Ocean Plan allows for minimal degradation within the zone of initial dilution as long

as the water quality objectives are maintained just outside the zone of initial dilution. The minimal degradation permitted by the Ocean Plan is consistent with the antidegradation policy because it maintains maximum benefit to the people of the State, it will not unreasonably affect the present and anticipated beneficial uses, and it will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in the policies.

The final effluent limitations from the previous order have been retained in this Order/Permit, except for heptachlor epoxide. Under CWA sections 402(o)(1)/303(d)(4)(B) for waters in attainment, removal of the final effluent limitations for heptachlor epoxide for the Discharge Point 001 is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR part 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 because the constituent has no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality objective and so the discharge at this outfall will not degrade existing high-quality water.

The mass-based final effluent limitations continue to be based on the design flow rate of 31.7 MGD.

3. **Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants**

This Order contains both technology-based and water quality-based effluent limitations for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on BOD₅20°C, TSS, and pH. This Order's technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements.

Water quality-based effluent limitations have been scientifically derived to implement water quality objectives that protect beneficial uses. Both the beneficial uses and the water quality objectives have been approved pursuant to federal law and the applicable federal water quality standards. The scientific procedures for calculating the individual water quality-based effluent limitations are based on the Ocean Plan, which was approved by the USEPA on February 14, 2006 and has since been further amended. Most beneficial uses and water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan were approved under state law and submitted to and approved by the USEPA prior to May 30, 2000. Any water quality objectives and beneficial uses submitted to USEPA prior to May 30, 2000, but not approved by USEPA before that date, are nonetheless "applicable water quality standards for purposes of the CWA" pursuant to 40 CFR section 131.21(c)(1). The remaining water quality objectives and beneficial uses implemented by this Order were approved by USEPA and are applicable water quality standards pursuant to section 131.21(c)(2). Collectively, this Order's restrictions on individual pollutants are no more stringent than required to implement the requirements of the CWA.

Table F-15. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations for Discharge Point 001

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations ¹⁰				Performance Goals ¹¹	Basis
		Average Monthly ¹²	Average Weekly ¹³	Maximum Daily ¹⁴	Instantaneous Maximum ¹⁵		
BOD ₅ 20°C ¹⁶	mg/L	30	45	--	--	--	Secondary Treatment
	lbs/day ¹⁷	7,960	11,900	--	--	--	
	% removal	85	--	--	--	--	
TSS	mg/L	30	45	--	--	--	Secondary Treatment/ Ocean Plan
	lbs/day ¹⁷	7,960	11,900	--	--	--	
	% removal	85	--	--	--	--	
pH	pH unit	6.0(instantaneous minimum)- 9.0(instantaneous maximum)					Secondary Treatment/ Ocean Plan
Oil and Grease	mg/L	25	40		75	--	Secondary Treatment/ Ocean Plan
	lbs/day ¹⁷	6,630	10,600		19,900	--	
Settleable Solids	ml/L	1.0	1.5		3.0		Secondary Treatment/ Ocean Plan
Turbidity	NTU	75	100		225		Secondary Treatment/ Ocean Plan
Temperature	°F				100		Thermal Plan

¹⁰ The minimum dilution ratio used to calculate effluent limitations for nonconventional and toxic pollutants for Discharge Point 001 is 1: 108 for all (i.e., 108 parts sea water to one-part effluent)

¹¹ The performance goals are based upon the actual performance data of the Oxnard Wastewater Treatment Plant and are specified only as an indication of the treatment efficiency of the plant. They are not considered effluent limitations or standards for the treatment plant. The Discharger shall make best efforts to maintain, if not improve, the effluent quality at the level of these performance goals. The Executive Officer of the Regional Water Board may modify any of the performance goals if the Discharger requests and has demonstrated that the change is warranted. See Procedures for the determination of performance goals at section V. of Fact Sheet.

¹² Average monthly effluent limitations for benzidine, PCBs, and TCDD equivalents at Discharge Point 001 are based on the 6-month median water quality objectives in the 2015 Ocean Plan.

¹³ For intermittent discharges, the daily value used to calculate the average monthly values shall be considered to equal zero for days on which no discharge occurred.

¹⁴ The maximum daily, average weekly and average monthly effluent limitations shall apply to flow weighted 24-hour composite samples. They may apply to grab samples if the collection of composite samples for those constituents is not appropriate because of the instability of the constituents.

¹⁵ The instantaneous maximum effluent limitations shall apply to grab samples.

¹⁶ Average Weekly and Monthly values may be calculated from daily measurements. Compliance with BOD and TSS % removal at EFF-001A.

¹⁷ The mass emission rates are based on the existing plant design flow rate of 31.7 MGD plus the brine waste, and are calculated as follows: Flow (MGD) x Concentration (mg/L) x 8.34 (conversion factor) = lbs/day.

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations ¹⁰				Performance Goals ¹¹	Basis
		Average Monthly ¹²	Average Weekly ¹³	Maximum Daily ¹⁴	Instantaneous Maximum ¹⁵		
Arsenic	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2 ¹⁸	No RP
Cadmium	µg/L	--	--	--	--	1 ¹⁹	No RP
Chromium (VI) ²⁰	µg/L	--	--	--	--	8	No RP
Copper	µg/L	--	--	--	--	30	No RP
Lead	µg/L	--	--	--	--	23	No RP
Mercury	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.3	No RP
Nickel	µg/L	--	--	--	--	8	No RP
Silver	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Selenium	µg/L	--	--	--	--	6.4	No RP
Zinc	µg/L	--	--	--	--	35	No RP
Cyanide	µg/L	--	--	--	--	25	No RP
Chlorine Residual	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.13	No RP
Ammonia as N	mg/L	--	--	--	--	43.8	No RP
Phenolic compounds non-chlorinated	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP
Phenolic compounds chlorinated	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.42	No RP
Endosulfan	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.05	No RP
HCH	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.1	No RP
Endrin	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.05	No RP
Chronic toxicity (TST) ²¹	Pass or Fail	--	--	Pass	--	--	Ocean Plan

¹⁸ The existing performance goal is carried forward based on best professional judgement because new information would otherwise call for a relaxation of the PG.

¹⁹ When conclusive but nonparametric finding of no reasonable potential is found, best professional judgement is used to retain existing PG.

²⁰ See Attachment A for definitions of terms.

²¹ The Chronic Toxicity final effluent limitation is protective of both the numeric acute and chronic toxicity 2015 Ocean Plan water quality objectives. The final effluent limitation will be implemented using *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to West Coast Marine and Estuarine Organisms* (EPA/600/R-95/136, 1995), current USEPA guidance in the *National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Test of Significant Toxicity Implementation Document* (EPA 833-R-10-003, June 2010) (http://water.epa.gov/polwaste/npdes/basics/upload/wet_final_tst_implementation2010.pdf) and *EPA Regions 8, 9, and 10, Toxicity Training Tool (January 2010)*. The Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL) shall be reported as "Pass" or "Fail." (Also % Effect (percent effect) shall be reported.) See the MRP

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations ¹⁰				Performance Goals ¹¹	Basis
		Average Monthly ¹²	Average Weekly ¹³	Maximum Daily ¹⁴	Instantaneous Maximum ¹⁵		
Radioactivity ²²							
Gross alpha	pCi/L	--	--	--	15	--	No RP, BPJ
Gross beta	pCi/L	--	--	--	50	--	No RP, BPJ
Combined Radium ²²⁶ and ²²⁸	pCi/L	--	--	--	5	--	No RP, BPJ
Tritium	pCi/L	--	--	--	20,000	--	No RP, BPJ
Strontium 90	pCi/L	--	--	--	8	--	No RP, BPJ
Uranium	pCi/L	--	--	--	20	--	No RP, BPJ
Human Health Toxicants – Non-Carcinogens							
Acrolein	µg/L	--	--	--	--	10	No RP
Antimony	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Bis (2-chloroethoxy) methane	µg/L	--	--	--	--	25	No RP
Bis (2-chloroisopropyl) ether	µg/L	--	--	--	--	10	No RP
Chlorobenzene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Chromium III	µg/L	--	--	--	--	8	No RP
Di-n-butylphthalate	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.33	No RP
Dichlorobenzenes	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Diethyl phthalate	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.25	No RP
Dimethyl phthalate	µg/L	--	--	--	--	10	No RP
2-Methyl-4,6-dinitrophenol	µg/L	--	--	--	--	25	No RP
2,4-Dinitrophenol	µg/L	--	--	--	--	25	No RP
Ethyl benzene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Fluoranthene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.25	No RP
Hexachlorocyclopentadine	µg/L	--	--	--	--	25	No RP
Nitrobenzene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP
Thallium	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP
Toluene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.6	No RP

²² Radioactivity: As noted in the 2015 California Ocean Plan: Not to exceed limits specified in Title 17, division 1, chapter 5, subchapter 4, group 3, article 3, section 30253 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR). Reference to section 30253 is prospective, including future changes to any incorporated provisions of federal law, as the changes take effect.

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations ¹⁰				Performance Goals ¹¹	Basis
		Average Monthly ¹²	Average Weekly ¹³	Maximum Daily ¹⁴	Instantaneous Maximum ¹⁵		
Tributyltin	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.0263	No RP
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Human Health Toxicants – Carcinogens							
Acrylonitrile	µg/L	--	--	--	--	10	No RP
Aldrin	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.025	No RP
Benzene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Benzidine	µg/L	0.0068	--	--	--	--	Inconclusive RP, Existing Limit
	lbs/day ¹⁷	0.0018	--	--	--		
Beryllium	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Bis (2-chloroethyl) ether	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP
Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate	µg/L	--	--	--	--	15	No RP
Carbon tetrachloride	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Chlordane	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.5	No RP
Chloro-dibromo-methane	µg/L	--	--	--	--	1.3	No RP
Chloroform	µg/L	--	--	--	--	1.2	No RP
DDT ²⁰	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.25	No RP
1,4-Dichloro-benzene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	3	No RP
3,3'-dichloro-benzidine	µg/L	--	--	--	--	25	No RP
1,2-Dichloro-ethane	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
1,1-Dichloro-ethylene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Bromodi-chloro-ethane	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Dichloro-methane	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
1,3-Dichloro-propene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Dieldrin	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.05	No RP
2,4-Dinitrotoluene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	25	No RP
1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations ¹⁰				Performance Goals ¹¹	Basis
		Average Monthly ¹²	Average Weekly ¹³	Maximum Daily ¹⁴	Instantaneous Maximum ¹⁵		
Halo-methanes ²⁰	µg/L	--	--	--	--	4.4	No RP
Heptachlor	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.05	No RP
Heptachlor epoxide	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.05 ²³	No RP
Hexachloro-benzene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP
Hexachloro-butadiene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP
Hexachloro-ethane	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP
Isophorone	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP
N-Nitrosodi-methylamine	µg/L	--	--	--	--	25	No RP
N-Nitrosodi-N-propylamine	µg/L	--	--	--	--	25	No RP
N-Nitrosodi-phenylamine	µg/L	--	--	--	--	5	No RP
PAHs ²⁰	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.097	No RP
PCBs ²⁰	µg/L	0.0019	--	--	--	--	Inconclusive RP, Existing Limit
	lbs/day ¹⁷	0.0005	--	--	--	--	
TCDD equivalents ²⁰	pg/L	0.00000039	--	--	--		Inconclusive RP, Existing Limit
	lbs/day ¹⁷	0.0000001					
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloro-ethane	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Tetrachloro-ethylene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Toxaphene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
Trichloro-ethylene	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
1,1,2-Tri-chloro-ethane	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP
2,4,6-Tri-chloro-phenol	µg/L	--	--	--	--	0.74	No RP
Vinyl chloride	µg/L	--	--	--	--	2.5	No RP

²³ A non paramateric RPA analysis concluded there was no need to maintain the limit in R4-2013-0094, as no detections were found. A value five times the minimum level in the 2015 Ocean Plan is used as the PG.

- E. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable
- F. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable
- G. Recycling Specifications – Not Applicable

V. PERFORMANCE GOALS

Section III.F.1, of the 2015 Ocean Plan allows the Regional Water Board to establish more restrictive water quality objectives and effluent limitations than those set forth in the 2015 Ocean Plan as necessary for the protection of the beneficial uses of ocean waters.

Pursuant to this provision and to implement the recommendation of the Water Quality Advisory Task Force (*Working Together for an Affordable Clean Water Environment, A final report presented to the California Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region by Water Quality Advisory Task Force*, September 30, 1993) that was adopted by the Regional Water Board on November 1, 1993, performance goals that are more stringent than those based on Ocean Plan objectives are prescribed in this Order. This approach is consistent with the antidegradation policy in that it requires the Discharger to maintain its treatment level and effluent quality, recognizing normal variations in treatment efficiency and sampling and analytical techniques. However, this approach does not address substantial changes in treatment plant operations that could significantly affect the quality of the treated effluent.

While performance goals were previously placed in many POTW permits in the Region, they have been discontinued for inland surface water discharges. For inland surface waters, the California Toxics Rule (40 CFR § 131.38) has resulted in effluent limitations as stringent as many performance goals. However, the Ocean Plan allows for significant dilution, and the continued use of performance goals serves to maintain existing treatment levels and effluent quality and supports State and federal antidegradation policies.

The performance goals are based upon the actual performance of the OWTP and are specified only as an indication of the treatment efficiency of the Facility. Performance goals are intended to minimize pollutant loading (primarily for toxics), while maintaining the incentive for future voluntary improvement of water quality whenever feasible, without the imposition of more stringent limits based on improved performance. They are not considered enforceable limitations or standards for the regulation of the discharge from the treatment facility. The Executive Officer may modify any of the performance goals if the Discharger requests and has demonstrated that the change is warranted.

A. Procedures for the Determination of Performance Goals

For constituents that have been routinely detected in the effluent (at least 20 percent detectable data), performance goals are based on the one-sided, upper 95 percent confidence bound for the 95th percentile of the effluent performance data (UCB95/95) from August 2013 through December 2017 using the RPA protocol contained in the 2015 Ocean Plan. Effluent data are assumed log normally distributed. Performance goals are calculated according to the equation $PG = Co + Dm (Co - Cs)$ and setting $Co = UCB95/95$.

1. If the maximum detected effluent concentration (MEC) is greater than the calculated performance goal, then the calculated performance goal is used as the performance goal;
2. If the maximum detected effluent concentration is less than the calculated performance goal, then the MEC is used as the performance goal, or;
3. If the performance goal determined in part 1 or 2 is greater than the WQO in the 2015 Ocean Plan after considering dilution, then the WQO is used as the performance goal.

For example, a performance goal for arsenic at Discharge Point 001 is calculated as follows:

Arsenic

$Co = UCB95/95 = 2.9835$; $Dm = 108$; $Cs = 3$

$C_{PG} = \text{Performance Goal} = 2.9835 + 108(2.9835 - 3) = 1.2015 \text{ } \mu\text{g/L}$

The existing PG in R4-2013-0094 is 2 $\mu\text{g/L}$ and given that the overall system process will change to expand recycled water production, resulting in comingled discharges of concentrated brine, the existing PG is maintained where the data would otherwise lead to a reduction of the Performance Goal. The final arsenic PG is 2 $\mu\text{g/L}$.

In some cases where monitoring data might otherwise trigger a much higher Performance Goal (PG), the existing PG is maintained to continue or improve current performance.

Another example is hexavalent chromium, where the new Maximum Effluent Concentration (MEC) remains below the existing performance goal and insufficient data is present to develop a PG more refined than a high value of 25 $\mu\text{g/L}$, calculated from a multiple of the minimum level. The existing PG of 8 $\mu\text{g/L}$ is maintained. In addition, the existing PG for trivalent chromium is also carried forward at 8 $\mu\text{g/L}$. Another example is mercury, where a higher performance goal was considered because the MEC of 0.38 $\mu\text{g/L}$ exceeded the existing PG of 0.3, but the calculated higher PG of 2.5 $\mu\text{g/L}$ was judged too large an increase in concentration to be allowed without triggering additional investigation into the source of the mercury given the 2014-2016 303(d) listing for historic mercury in the adjacent Santa Monica Bay.

For constituents where monitoring data have consistently shown nondetectable levels (less than 20 percent detectable data), the existing performance goals are maintained or set at 5 times the minimum level (ML) given in the 2015 Ocean Plan. If the maximum detected effluent concentration is less than the calculated value based on ML, then the MEC is used as the performance goal. In some cases where monitoring data might otherwise trigger a much higher Performance Goal (PG), the existing PG is maintained to continue or improve current performance. Examples are Di-n-Butyl Phthalate, Diethyl phthalate, Fluoranthene, Toluene, Tributyltin, and Chlorodibromomethane.

For nickel, where the MEC is below the performance goal of 8, the improved performance means the PG would go down. The existing value is maintained as the brine concentration change could result in increased levels, but still result in additional recycled water production and protection of marine aquatic life. Similarly, falling effluent concentrations for residual chlorine would otherwise result in a reduced PG, but the use of chlorine for disinfection during multiple treatment steps to optimize the production of recycled water increases the need for flexibility in performance. The existing residual chlorine value is used.

For lead, the existing PG of 23 $\mu\text{g/L}$ is maintained and is above the detection of 19 $\mu\text{g/L}$. Detections of 5.7, 11.8 and 13.9 $\mu\text{g/L}$ demonstrate that the metal is present in the effluent with some consistency. The data would result in a very small calculated performance goal of 2.5 $\mu\text{g/L}$, which could not be attained, but would lead to additional study about the source of the metal. In this case, existing lead concentration is known to be sourced by the collection system's historic piping, which is being replaced with construction upgrades. Maintaining the performance goal will ensure this activity continues and protects against the introduction of new sources of lead.

The limit for heptachlor epoxide is no longer needed because monitoring data is present and no reasonable potential is present. The PG would be higher than the existing limit of 0.002 $\mu\text{g/L}$, to PG of 0.05, but is applied here because there is no need to maintain continued performance at the lower level in the absence of reasonable potential to cause or contribute to the exceedance of a water quality objective.

Performance goals for Discharge Point 001 are prescribed in this Order. The listed performance goals are not enforceable effluent limitations or standards. The Discharger shall maintain, if not improve, its treatment efficiency. Any two exceedances of the performance goals shall trigger an investigation into the cause of the exceedance. If the exceedance persists in three successive monitoring periods, the Discharger shall submit a written report to the Regional Water Board on the nature of the exceedance, the results of the investigation as to the cause of the exceedance, and the corrective actions taken or proposed corrective measures with timetable for implementation, if necessary.

VI. RATIONALE FOR RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS.

A. Surface Water

The Basin Plan and the Ocean Plan contain numeric and narrative water quality objectives applicable to all surface waters within the Los Angeles Region. Water quality objectives include an objective to maintain the high-quality waters pursuant to federal regulations (40 CFR 131.12) and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. Receiving water limitations in the tentative Order are included to ensure protection of beneficial uses of the receiving water.

B. Groundwater – Not Applicable.

VII. RATIONALE FOR PROVISIONS.

A. Standard Provisions

Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with 40 CFR section 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with 40 CFR section 122.42, are provided in Attachment D to the Order.

Sections 122.41(a)(1) and (b) through (n) of 40 CFR establish conditions that apply to all State-issued NPDES permits. These conditions must be incorporated into the permits either expressly or by reference. If incorporated by reference, a specific citation to the regulations must be included in the Order. Section 123.25(a)(12) allows the state to omit or modify conditions to impose more stringent requirements. In accordance with 40 CFR section 123.25, this Order omits federal conditions that address enforcement authority specified in 40 CFR sections 122.41(j)(5) and (k)(2) because the enforcement authority under the CWC is more stringent. In lieu of these conditions, this Order incorporates by reference CWC section 13387(e).

B. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

These provisions are based on 40 CFR § 123.25. The Regional Water Board may reopen the Order to modify conditions and requirements. Causes for modifications can include, but are not limited to, the promulgation of new regulations, modification in biosolids use or disposal practices, or adoption of new regulations by the State Water Board or Regional Water Board, including revisions to the Ocean Plan and Basin Plan.

2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements

a. Antidegradation Analysis and Engineering Report for Proposed Plant

Expansion: This provision is based on the State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16, which requires the Regional Water Board in regulating the discharge of waste to maintain high quality waters of the state. The Discharger must demonstrate that it has implemented adequate controls (e.g., adequate treatment capacity) to ensure that high quality waters will be maintained. This provision requires the Discharger to clarify that it has increased plant capacity through the addition of new treatment system(s) to obtain alternative effluent limitations for the discharge from the

- d. **Collection System.** The State Water Board issued General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, Water Quality Order 2006-0003-DWQ (General Order) on May 2, 2006. The State Water Board amended the Monitoring and Reporting Program for the General Order through Order WQ 2013-0058-EXEC on August 6, 2013. The General Order requires public agencies that own or operate sanitary sewer systems with sewer lines one mile of pipe or greater to enroll for coverage and comply with the General Order. The General Order requires agencies to develop sanitary sewer management plans and report all sanitary sewer overflows, among other requirements and prohibitions

6. Compliance Schedules – Not applicable

VIII. RATIONALE FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 308(a) of the federal Clean Water Act and sections 122.41(h), (j)-(l), 122.44(i), and 122.48 of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations (40 CFR) require that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. CWC sections 13267 and 13383 also authorize the Regional Water Board to establish monitoring, inspection, entry, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements. The MRP establishes monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping requirements that implement federal and state requirements. The following provides the rationale for the monitoring and reporting requirements in the MRP for this facility.

A. Influent Monitoring

Influent monitoring is required to determine compliance with NPDES permit conditions, assess treatment plant performance, and assess effectiveness of the Pretreatment Program. Influent monitoring in this Order follows the influent monitoring requirements in the previous Order.

B. Effluent Monitoring

The Discharger is required to conduct monitoring of the permitted discharges in order to evaluate compliance with permit limitations and conditions. Monitoring requirements are specified in the MRP (Attachment E). This Order requires compliance with the MRP, and is based on 40 CFR § 122.48, 122.44(i), 122.41(j), 122.62, 122.63, and 124.5. The MRP is a standard requirement in NPDES permits (including this Order) issued by the Regional Water Board. In addition to containing definition of terms, it specifies general sampling/analytical protocols and the requirements of reporting spills, violation, and routine monitoring data in accordance with NPDES regulations, the CWC, and Regional Water Board policies. The MRP also contains sampling program specific for the Discharger's wastewater treatment plant. It defines the sampling stations and frequency, pollutants to be monitored, and additional reporting requirements. Pollutants to be monitored include all pollutants for which effluent limitations are specified.

Monitoring for those pollutants expected to be present in the discharge from the facility, will be required as shown on the proposed MRP (Attachment E) and as required in the Ocean Plan.

Monitoring frequency for the constituents is based on historic monitoring frequency, Best Professional Judgment, and the following criteria:

Criterion 1: Monitoring frequency will be monthly for those pollutants with reasonable potential to exceed water quality objectives (monitoring has shown an exceedance of the objectives) or where Best Professional Judgment indicates additional monitoring is necessary due to existing or anticipated changes in the treatment process or environment;

Criterion 2: Monitoring frequency will be quarterly for those pollutants in which some or all of the historic effluent monitoring data detected the pollutants, but without reasonable potential to exceed water quality objectives; and

Criterion 3: Monitoring frequency will be semiannually for those pollutants in which all of the historic effluent monitoring data have had non-detected concentrations of the pollutants and without current reasonable potential to exceed water quality objectives.

Table F-16. Effluent Monitoring Frequency Comparison

Parameter	Monitoring Frequency (2013 Permit)	Monitoring Frequency (2018 Permit)
Flow	Continuous	Continuous
BOD ₅ 20°C	daily	weekly
Total Suspended Solids	daily	weekly
pH	daily	weekly
Oil and Grease	daily	weekly
Temperature	weekly	weekly
Settleable Solids	daily	weekly
Turbidity	continuous	continuous
Nitrate Nitrogen	monthly	monthly
Nitrite Nitrogen	monthly	monthly
Organic Nitrogen	monthly	monthly
Total coliform	daily	daily
Fecal Coliform	5 times/month	5 times/month
<i>Enterococcus</i>	5 times/month	5 times/month
Arsenic	semiannually	semiannually
Cadmium	semiannually	semiannually
Chromium VI	semiannually	semiannually
Copper	semiannually	semiannually
Lead	semiannually	semiannually
Mercury	semiannually	semiannually
Nickel	semiannually	semiannually
Selenium	semiannually	semiannually
Silver	semiannually	semiannually
Zinc	semiannually	semiannually
Cyanide	semiannually	semiannually
Total Residual Chlorine	continuous	continuous
Ammonia Nitrogen	monthly	monthly
Toxicity, Chronic	monthly	monthly
Phenolic Compounds (non-chlorinated)	semiannually	semiannually
Phenolic Compounds (chlorinated)	semiannually	semiannually
Endosulfan	semiannually	semiannually
Endrin	semiannually	semiannually
HCH	semiannually	semiannually

Parameter	Monitoring Frequency (2013 Permit)	Monitoring Frequency (2018 Permit)
Radioactivity (including gross alpha, gross beta, combined radium-226 & radium-228, tritium, strontium-90 and uranium)	semiannually	semiannually
Acrolein	semiannually	semiannually
Antimony	semiannually	semiannually
Bis(2-chloroethoxy) methane	semiannually	semiannually
Bis(2-chloroisopropyl) ether	semiannually	semiannually
Chlorobenzene	semiannually	semiannually
Chromium (III)	semiannually	semiannually
Di-n-butyl-phthalate	semiannually	semiannually
Dichlorobenzenes	semiannually	semiannually
Diethyl phthalate	semiannually	semiannually
Dimethyl phthalate	semiannually	semiannually
4,6-dinitro-2-methylphenol	semiannually	semiannually
2,4-Dinitrophenol	semiannually	semiannually
Ethylbenzene	semiannually	semiannually
Fluoranthene	semiannually	semiannually
Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	semiannually	semiannually
Nitrobenzene	semiannually	semiannually
Thallium	semiannually	semiannually
Toluene	semiannually	semiannually
Tributyltin	semiannually	semiannually
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	semiannually	semiannually
Acrylonitrile	semiannually	semiannually
Aldrin	semiannually	semiannually
Benzene	semiannually	semiannually
Benzidine	quarterly	quarterly
Beryllium	semiannually	semiannually
Bis(2-chloroethyl) ether	semiannually	semiannually
Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate	semiannually	semiannually
Carbon tetrachloride	semiannually	semiannually
Chlordane	semiannually	semiannually
Chlorodibromomethane	semiannually	semiannually
Chloroform	semiannually	semiannually
DDT	semiannually	semiannually
1,4-dichlorobenzene	semiannually	semiannually
3,3'-dichlorobenzidine	semiannually	semiannually

Parameter	Monitoring Frequency (2013 Permit)	Monitoring Frequency (2018 Permit)
1,2-Dichloroethane	semiannually	semiannually
1,1-Dichloroethylene	semiannually	semiannually
Dichlorobromomethane	semiannually	semiannually
Dichloromethane	semiannually	semiannually
1,3-Dichloropropene	semiannually	semiannually
Dieldrin	semiannually	semiannually
2,4-dinitrotoluene	semiannually	semiannually
1,2-diphenylhydrazine	semiannually	semiannually
Halomethanes	semiannually	semiannually
Heptachlor	semiannually	semiannually
Heptachlor epoxide	quarterly	semiannually
Hexachlorobenzene	semiannually	semiannually
Hexachlorobutadiene	semiannually	semiannually
Hexachloroethane	semiannually	semiannually
Isophorone	semiannually	semiannually
N-Nitrosodimethylamine	semiannually	semiannually
N-Nitrosodi-N-propylamine	semiannually	semiannually
N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	semiannually	semiannually
PAHs	semiannually	semiannually
PCBs as Aroclors	quarterly	quarterly
PCBs as Congeners	semiannually	semiannually
TCDD Equivalents	quarterly	quarterly
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	semiannually	semiannually
Tetrachloroethylene	semiannually	semiannually
Toxaphene	semiannually	semiannually
Trichloroethylene	semiannually	semiannually
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	semiannually	semiannually
2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	semiannually	semiannually
Vinyl chloride	semiannually	semiannually
Methyl-tert-butyl-ether	semiannually	semiannually
Remaining pollutants in Table B of the 2009 Ocean Plan	semiannually	semiannually

C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements

The rationale for WET has been discussed extensively in section IV.C.6. of this Fact Sheet.

D. Receiving Water Monitoring.

1. Surface Water and Benthic Monitoring

Receiving water, benthic infauna, and sediment chemistry monitoring is required to determine compliance with receiving water limitations, to characterize the water quality of the receiving water, and ensure beneficial uses are protected. Requirements are based on the Ocean Plan and the Basin Plan. The conceptual framework for the receiving water program has three components that comprise a range of spatial and temporal scales: (a) core monitoring; (b) regional monitoring; and (c) special studies. Additional information can be found in this attachment at II.F and the monitoring and reporting program in Attachment E.

2. Groundwater – Not Applicable

E. Other Monitoring Requirements

1. Outfall Inspection

This survey investigates the condition of the outfall structures to determine if the structures are in serviceable condition to ensure their continued safe operation. The data collected will be used for a periodic assessment of the integrity of the outfall pipes and ballasting system.

2. Biosolids/Sludge Monitoring

Attachment H establishes monitoring and reporting requirements for the storage, handling and disposal practices of biosolids/sludge generated from the operation of this POTW.

3. Discharge Monitoring Report-Quality Assurance (DMR-QA) Study Program

Under the authority of section 308 of the CWA (33 U.S.C. § 1318), USEPA requires major and selected minor dischargers under the NPDES Program to participate in the annual DMR-QA Study Program. The DMR-QA Study evaluates the analytical ability of laboratories that routinely perform or support self-monitoring analyses required by NPDES permits. There are two options to satisfy the requirements of the DMR-QA Study Program: (1) The Discharger can obtain and analyze a DMR-QA sample as part of the DMR-QA Study; or (2) Per the waiver issued by USEPA to the State Water Board, the Discharger can submit the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study from its own laboratories or its contract laboratories. A Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study is similar to the DMR-QA Study. Thus, it also evaluates a laboratory's ability to analyze wastewater samples to produce quality data that ensure the integrity of the NPDES Program. The Discharger shall ensure that the results of the DMR-QA Study or the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study are submitted annually to the State Water Board. The State Water Board's Quality Assurance Program Officer will send the DMR-QA Study results or the results of the most recent Water Pollution Performance Evaluation Study to USEPA's DMR-QA Coordinator and Quality Assurance Manager.

IX. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.

The Regional Water Board has considered the issuance of WDRs that will serve as an NPDES permit for Oxnard Wastewater Treatment Plant. As a step in the WDR adoption process, the Regional Water Board staff has developed tentative WDRs and has encouraged public participation in the WDR adoption process.

A. Notification of Interested Parties

The Regional Water Board notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDRs for the discharge and provided an opportunity to submit written comments and recommendations. Notification was provided through the following:

The public had access to the Regional Board's website at <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/>.

B. Written Comments

Interested persons were invited to submit written comments concerning tentative WDRs as provided through the notification process. Comments were due either in person or by mail to the Executive Office at the Regional Water Board at the address on the cover page of this Order, or by email submitted to elizabeth.erickson@waterboards.ca.gov.

To be fully responded to by staff and considered by the Regional Water Board, the written comments were due at the Regional Water Board office by 5:00 p.m. on **September 17, 2018**.

C. Public Hearing

The Regional Water Board held a public hearing on the tentative WDRs during its regular Board meeting on the following date and time and at the following location:

Date: October 11, 2018

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Location: Metropolitan Water District's Board Room,
700 North Alameda Street,
Los Angeles, 90012.

Interested persons were invited to attend. At the public hearing, the Regional Water Board heard testimony, pertinent to the discharge, WDRs, and permit. For accuracy of the record, important testimony was requested in writing.

The Regional Water Board's web address is www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles where interested persons can access the current agenda for changes in Board meeting dates, times, and venues.

D. Reconsideration of Waste Discharge Requirements

Any aggrieved person may petition the State Water Board to review the decision of the Regional Water Board regarding the final WDRs. The petition must be received by the State Water Board at the following address within 30 calendar days of the Regional Water Board's action:

State Water Resources Control Board
Office of Chief Counsel
P.O. Box 100, 1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100

For instructions on how to file a petition for review, see:

<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality/wqpetition_instr.shtml>

E. Information and Copying

The ROWD, related documents, tentative effluent limitations and special conditions, comments received, and other information are on file and may be inspected at 320 West 4th Street, Suite 200, Los Angeles, California and 75 Hawthorne Street, San Francisco, California any time between 8:30 a.m. and 4:45 p.m., Monday through Friday. Copying of documents may be arranged through the Regional Water Board by calling (213) 576-6600.

F. Register of Interested Persons

Any person interested in being placed on the mailing list for information regarding the WDRs and NPDES permit should contact the Regional Water Board, reference this facility, and provide a name, address, and phone number.

G. Additional Information

Requests for additional information or questions regarding this Order should be directed to Elizabeth Erickson at (213) 576-6665 or elizabeth.erickson@waterboards.ca.gov.

TENTATIVE

ATTACHMENT G – TOXICITY REDUCTION EVALUATION (TRE) WORK PLAN OUTLINE

- 1. Gather and Review Information and Data**
 - A. POTW Operations and Performance
 - B. POTW Influent and Pretreatment Program
 - C. Effluent Data, including Toxicity Results
 - D. Sludge (Biosolids) Data
- 2. Evaluate Facility Performance**
- 3. Conduct Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE)**
- 4. Evaluate Sources and In-Plant Controls**
- 5. Implement Toxicity Control Measures**
- 6. Conduct Confirmatory Toxicity Testing**

H.

**ATTACHMENT H– BIOSOLIDS AND SLUDGE MANAGEMENT
BIOSOLIDS USE AND DISPOSAL REQUIREMENTS**

(Note: “Biosolids” refers to non-hazardous sewage sludge as defined in 40 CFR §503.9. Sewage sludge that is hazardous, as defined in 40 CFR part 261, must be disposed of in accordance with the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).) 40 CFR §503 requirements identified below are for information only and are not regulated by this Order.

I. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

- A. All biosolids generated by the Discharger shall be reused or disposed of in compliance with the applicable portions of:
 - 1. 40 CFR part 503: for biosolids that are land applied, placed in surface disposal sites (dedicated land disposal sites or monofills), or incinerated; 40 CFR § 503 Subpart B (land application) applies to biosolids placed on the land for the purposes of providing nutrients or conditioning the soil for crops or vegetation. 40 CFR § 503 Subpart C (surface disposal) applies to biosolids placed on land for the purpose of disposal.
 - 2. 40 CFR part 258: for biosolids disposed of in a municipal solid waste landfill.
 - 3. 40 CFR part 257: for all biosolids use and disposal practices not covered under 40 CFR parts 258 or 503.
- B. The Discharger is responsible for assuring that all biosolids from its facility are used or disposed of in accordance with 40 CFR part 503, whether the Discharger uses or disposes of the biosolids itself, or transfers their biosolids to another party for further treatment, reuse, or disposal. The Discharger is responsible for informing subsequent preparers, appliers, and disposers of requirements they must meet under 40 CFR part 503.
- C. Duty to mitigate: The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to prevent or minimize any biosolids use or disposal which may adversely impact human health or the environment.
- D. No biosolids shall be allowed to enter wetland or other waters of the United States.
- E. Biosolids treatment, storage, use or disposal shall not contaminate groundwater.
- F. Biosolids treatment, storage, use or disposal shall not create a nuisance such as objectionable odors or flies.
- G. The Discharger shall assure that haulers transporting biosolids off site for further treatment, storage, reuse, or disposal take all necessary measures to keep the biosolids contained.
- H. If biosolids are stored for over two years from the time they are generated, the Discharger must ensure compliance with all the requirements for surface disposal under 40 CFR part 503 Subpart C, or must submit a written request to USEPA with the information in part 503.20 (b), requesting permission for longer temporary storage.
- I. Sewage sludge containing more than 50 mg/kg PCBs shall be disposed of in accordance with 40 CFR part 761.
- J. There shall be adequate screening at the plant headworks and/or at the biosolids treatment units to ensure that all pieces of metal, plastic, glass, and other inert

objects with a diameter greater than 3/8 inches are removed.

II. MONITORING

- A. Biosolids shall be monitored for the metals required in 40 CFR § 503.16 (for land application) or § 503.26 (for surface disposal), using the methods in "Test Methods for Evaluating Solids Waste, Physical/Chemical Methods" (SW-846), as required in 503.8(b)(4), at the following minimum frequencies:

Amount of Sewage Sludge (Metric Tons per 365 day period)	Frequency
Greater than 0 but less than 290	Once per year
Equal to or greater than 290 but less than 1,500	Once per quarter
Equal to or greater than 1,500 but less than 15,000	Once per 60 days
Equal to or greater than 15,000	Once per month

For accumulated, previously untested biosolids, the Discharger shall develop a representative sampling plan, which addresses the number and location of sampling points, and collect representative samples.

Test results shall be expressed in milligrams pollutant per kilogram biosolids on a 100% dry weight basis.

Biosolids to be land applied shall be tested for organic nitrogen, ammonia nitrogen, and nitrate nitrogen at the frequencies required above.

- B. Biosolids shall be monitored for the following constituents at the frequency stipulated in 40 CFR § 503.16: arsenic, cadmium, copper, lead, mercury, molybdenum, nickel, selenium, zinc, organic nitrogen, ammonia nitrogen, and total solids. If biosolids are removed for use or disposal on a routine basis, sampling should be scheduled for regular intervals throughout the year. If biosolids are stored for an extended period prior to use or disposal, sampling may occur at regular intervals, or samples of the accumulated stockpile may be collected prior to use or disposal, corresponding to the tons accumulated in the stockpile for that period.
- C. Class 1 facilities (facilities with pretreatment programs or others designated as Class 1 by the Regional Administrator) and Federal facilities with > 5 MGD influent flow shall sample biosolids for pollutants listed under section 307 (a) of the Clean Water Act (as required in the pretreatment section of the permit for POTWs with pretreatment programs).

III. PATHOGEN AND VECTOR CONTROL

- A. Prior to land application, the Discharger shall demonstrate that the biosolids meet Class A or Class B pathogen reduction levels by one of the methods listed in 40 CFR § 503.32. Prior to disposal in a surface disposal site, the Discharger shall demonstrate that the biosolids meet Class B levels or shall ensure that the site is covered at the end of each operating day.
- B. If pathogen reduction is demonstrated using a "Process to Further Reduce Pathogens," the Discharger shall maintain daily records of the operating parameters used to achieve this reduction. If pathogen reduction is demonstrated by testing for fecal coliform and/or pathogens, samples must be collected at the frequency specified in Table 1 of 40 CFR § 503.16. If Class B is demonstrated using fecal coliform, at least seven grab samples must be collected during each monitoring period and a geometric mean calculated from these samples. The following holding times between sample collection and analysis shall not be exceeded: fecal coliform – 6 hours when cooled to

<4 degrees Celsius (extended to 24 hours when cooled to <4 degrees Celsius for Class A composted, Class B aerobically digested, and Class B anaerobically digested sample types); Salmonella spp. Bacteria – 24 hours when cooled to <4 degrees Celsius (unless using Method 1682 – 6 hours when cooled to 10 degrees Celsius); enteric viruses – 6 hours when cooled to <10 degrees Celsius (extended to one month when cooled to <4 degrees Celsius).

- C. For biosolids that are land applied or placed in a surface disposal site, the Discharger shall track and keep records of the operational parameters used to achieve Vector Attraction Reduction requirements in 40 CFR § 503.33 (b).

IV. NOTIFICATIONS

The Discharger either directly or through contractual arrangements with their biosolids management contractors shall comply with the following 40 CFR part 503 notification requirements:

A. Notification of Non-compliance

The Discharger shall require appliers of their biosolids to notify USEPA Region 9 and their state permitting agency of any noncompliance within 24 hours if the non-compliance may seriously endanger health or the environment. For other instances of non-compliance, the Discharger shall require appliers of their biosolids to notify USEPA Region 9 and their state permitting agency of the non-compliance in writing within 10 working days of becoming aware of the non-compliance.

B. Interstate Notification

If bulk biosolids are shipped to another State or to Indian Lands, the Discharger must send written notice within 60 days of the shipment and prior to the initial application of bulk biosolids to the permitting authorities in the receiving State or Indian Land (the USEPA Regional Office for the area and the State/Indian authorities).

C. Land Application Notification

Prior to using any biosolids from this facility (other than Class A EQ composted biosolids or heat dried biosolids) at a new or previously unreported site, the Discharger shall notify USEPA and the State. This notification shall include the description and topographic map of the proposed site(s), names and addresses of the applier, and site owner, and a listing of any State or local permits which must be obtained. It shall also include a description of the crops or vegetation to be grown, proposed loading rates, and a determination of agronomic rates.

Within a given monitoring period, if any biosolids do not meet the applicable metals concentration limits specified under 40 CFR § 503.13, then the Discharger must pre-notify USEPA, and determine the cumulative metals loadings at that site to date, as required by 40 CFR § 503.12.

D. Surface Disposal Notification

Prior to disposal at a new or previously unreported site, the Discharger shall notify USEPA and the State. The notice shall include a description and topographic map of the proposed site, depth to groundwater, whether the site is lined or unlined, site operator and site owner, and any state or local permits. It shall also describe procedures for ensuring grazing and public access restrictions for three years following site closure. The notice shall include a groundwater monitoring plan or description of why groundwater monitoring is not required.

V. REPORTING

The Discharger shall submit an annual biosolids report to USEPA Region 9 Biosolids Coordinator by February 19 of each calendar year. The report shall include:

- A. The amount of biosolids generated that year, in dry metric tons, and the amount accumulated from previous years.
- B. Results of all pollutant monitoring required in the Monitoring Section above. Results must be reported on a 100% dry weight basis.
- C. Descriptions of pathogen reduction methods, and vector attraction reduction methods, as required in 40 CFR § 503.17 and 503.27, and certifications.
- D. Results of any groundwater monitoring or certification by groundwater scientist that the placement of biosolids in a surface disposal site will not contaminate an aquifer.
- E. Except for Class A EQ composted and heat dried biosolids, names and addresses of land appliers and surface disposal site operators, and volumes applied (dry metric tons).
- F. Names and addresses of persons who received biosolids for storage, further treatment, disposal in a municipal waste landfill, deep well injection, or other reuse/disposal methods not covered above, and volumes delivered to each.

The following information must be submitted by the Discharger, unless the Discharger requires its biosolids management contractors to report this information directly to the USEPA Region 9 Biosolids Coordinator.

For land application sites (except sites where Class A EQ composted biosolids and heat dried biosolids are applied): locations of land application sites (with field names and numbers) used that calendar year, size of each field applied to, applier, and site owner; volumes applied to each field (in wet tons and dry metric tons), nitrogen applied, and calculated plant available nitrogen; crops planted, dates of planting, and dates of harvesting; for biosolids exceeding 40 CFR Part 503.13 Table 3 metals concentrations, the locations of sites where the biosolids were applied and cumulative metals loadings at the sites to date; certification of management practices at 40 CFR Part 503.14; and certifications of site restrictions at 40 CFR Part 503.32(b)(5).

For surface disposal sites: locations of sites, site operator and site owner, size of parcel on which biosolids were disposed, results of any groundwater monitoring, and certifications of management practices at 40 CFR Part 503.24.

- G. The annual biosolids report shall be submitted to USEPA using USEPA's NPDES Electronic Reporting Tool (NeT) and can be accessed at <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/national-pollutant-discharge-elimination-system-npdes-electronic-reporting-tool-net-fact>

I.

ATTACHMENT I – PRETREATMENT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The Discharger is required to submit annual Pretreatment Program Compliance Report (Report) to the Regional Water Board and United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9 (USEPA). This Attachment outlines the minimum reporting requirements of the Report. If there is any conflict between requirements stated in this attachment and provisions stated in the Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs), those contained in the WDRs will prevail.

A. Pretreatment Requirements

1. The Discharger shall be responsible and liable for the performance of all Control Authority pretreatment requirements contained in 40 CFR part 403, including any subsequent regulatory revisions to part 403. Where part 403 or subsequent revision places mandatory actions upon the Discharger as Control Authority but does not specify a timetable for completion of the actions, the Discharger shall complete the required actions within six months from the issuance date of this permit or the effective date of the part 403 revisions, whichever comes later. For violations of pretreatment requirements, the Discharger shall be subject to enforcement actions, penalties, fines and other remedies by the USEPA or other appropriate parties, as provided in the Act. USEPA may initiate enforcement action against a nondomestic user for noncompliance with applicable standards and requirements as provided in the act.
2. The Discharger shall enforce the requirements promulgated under sections 307(b), 307(c), 307(d) and 402(b) of the Act with timely, appropriate and effective enforcement actions. The Discharger shall cause all nondomestic users subject to federal categorical standards to achieve compliance no later than the date specified in those requirements or, in the case of a new nondomestic user, upon commencement of the discharge.
3. The Discharger shall perform the pretreatment functions as required in 40 CFR part 403 including, but not limited to:
 - a. Implement the necessary legal authorities as provided in 40 CFR part 403.8(f)(1);
 - b. Enforce the pretreatment requirements under 40 CFR parts 403.5 and 403.6;
 - c. Implement the programmatic functions as provided in 40 CFR part 403.8(f)(2); and
 - d. Provide the requisite funding and personnel to implement the pretreatment program as provided in 40 CFR part 403.8(f)(3).
4. The Discharger shall submit annually a report to USEPA Pacific Southwest Region, and the State describing its pretreatment activities over the previous year. In the event the Discharger is not in compliance with any conditions or requirements of this permit, then the Discharger shall also include the reasons for noncompliance and state how and when the Discharger shall comply with such conditions and requirements. This annual report shall cover operations from January 1 through December 31 and is due on April 15 of each year. The report shall contain, but not be limited to, the following information:
 - a. A summary of analytical results from representative, flow proportioned, 24-hour composite sampling of the publicly-owned treatment works (POTW)

influent and effluent for those pollutants USEPA has identified under section 307(a) of the Act which are known or suspected to be discharged by nondomestic users. This will consist of an annual full priority pollutant scan, with quarterly samples analyzed only for those pollutants detected in the full scan. The Discharger is not required to sample and analyze for asbestos. Sludge sampling and analysis are covered in the sludge section of this permit. The Discharger shall also provide any influent or effluent monitoring data for nonpriority pollutants which the Discharger believes may be causing or contributing to interference or pass through. Sampling and analysis shall be performed with the techniques prescribed in 40 CFR part 136;

- b. A discussion of Upset, Interference or Pass Through incidents, if any, at the treatment plant which the Discharger knows or suspects were caused by nondomestic users of the POTW system. The discussion shall include the reasons why the incidents occurred, the corrective actions taken and, if known, the name and address of the nondomestic user(s) responsible. The discussion shall also include a review of the applicable pollutant limitations to determine whether any additional limitations, or changes to existing requirements, may be necessary to prevent pass through or interference;
- c. An updated list of the Discharger's significant industrial users (SIUs) including their names and addresses, and a list of deletions, additions and SIU name changes keyed to the previously submitted list. The Discharger shall provide a brief explanation for each change. The list shall identify the SIUs subject to federal categorical standards by specifying which set(s) of standards are applicable to each SIU. The list shall also indicate which SIUs are subject to local limitations;
- d. The Discharger shall characterize the compliance status of each SIU by providing a list or table which includes the following information:
 - i. Name of the SIU;
 - ii. Category, if subject to federal categorical standards;
 - iii. The type of wastewater treatment or control processes in place;
 - iv. The number of samples taken by the POTW during the year;
 - v. The number of samples taken by the SIU during the year;
 - vi. For an SIU subject to discharge requirements for total toxic organics, whether all required certifications were provided;
 - vii. A list of the standards violated during the year. Identify whether the violations were for categorical standards or local limits;
 - viii. Whether the facility is in significant noncompliance (SNC) as defined at 40 CFR part 403.8(f)(2)(viii) at any time during the year; and
 - ix. A summary of enforcement or other actions taken during the year to return the SIU to compliance. Describe the type of action, final compliance date, and the amount of fines and penalties collected, if any. Describe any proposed actions for bringing the SIU into compliance.
- e. A brief description of any programs the POTW implements to reduce pollutants from nondomestic users that are not classified as SIUs;

- f. A brief description of any significant changes in operating the pretreatment program which differ from the previous year including, but not limited to, changes concerning the program's administrative structure, local limits, monitoring program or monitoring frequencies, legal authority, enforcement policy, funding levels, or staffing levels;
- g. A summary of the annual pretreatment budget, including the cost of pretreatment program functions and equipment purchases; and
- h. A summary of activities to involve and inform the public of the program including a copy of the newspaper notice, if any, required under 40 CFR part 403.8(f)(2)(viii).

B. LOCAL LIMITS EVALUATION

- 1. In accordance with 40 CFR part 122.44(j)(2)(ii), the POTW shall provide a written technical evaluation of the need to revise local limits under 40 CFR part 403.5(c)(1) within 180 days of issuance or reissuance of the Oxnard Wastewater Treatment Plant NPDES permit. The evaluation shall specify when the next revision is planned given the local limits were revised in 2018.

C. SIGNATORY REQUIREMENTS AND REPORT SUBMITTAL

- 1. Signatory Requirements.

The annual report must be signed by a principal executive officer, ranking elected official or other duly authorized employee if such employee is responsible for the overall operation of the POTW. Any person signing these reports must make the following certification [40 CFR part 403.6(a)(2)(ii)]:

I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.

- 2. Report Submittal.

The Annual Pretreatment Report shall be submitted electronically using the State Water Board's California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) Program website <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/ciwqs/index.html>. The CIWQS website will provide additional information for SMR submittal in the event there will be a planned service interruption for electronic submittal.

A copy of the Annual Pretreatment Report must be sent to USEPA electronically to the following address: R9Pretreatment@epa.gov